

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the application. Independent Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to further define the holding member as detachably attached to the portable device body for changing the battery. Support for the claim amendments is found at page 5, lines 11 to 17 of the specification. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

Waldmeier (U.S. Patent No. 4, 275, 810) fails to disclose or suggest an electronic component powered by a battery. Rather, Waldmeier discloses an electronic or other data carrier, such as a microfilm, storing stone information, such as weight and size relating to a precious stone.

Waldmeier does not suggest of accommodating an electronic component and a battery in a portable device body. Rather, Waldmeier merely suggests of accommodating a data carrier, which does not require a battery, in the disks 2 and 3.

Waldmeier does not disclose or suggest a holding member which is detachable from the portable device body for changing the battery accommodated in the portable device body. Rather, Waldmeier merely discloses the disks 2 and 3, which can be separated only upon the destruction of the package of Waldmeier. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would not combine Waldmeier with Elliot (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0164993) with an expectation to arrive at the claimed invention. By combining Waldmeier and Elliot, the results are a worthless portable device in which a battery cannot be changed. For at least this reason, Claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Waldmeier in view of Elliot.

The Examiner states in the Response to Arguments section of the outstanding Office Action that (a) Waldmeier clearly teaches that an electronic component is encased between disks 2 and 3 (see column 3, lines 50-53), and (b) it does not matter whether or not the electronic component needs routine maintenance because those features upon which applications relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

In view of the foregoing amendments, those features are now recited in Claims 1 and 11. Therefore the arguments filed on March 8, 2007 are now persuasive and the present application is now in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

June 15, 2007

Date

/John R. Brancolini/

John R. Brancolini

Registration No. 57,218

**SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP**  
1101 Market Street  
Suite 2600  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189